

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 10-16, 19-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, and 32 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 10-16, 19-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, and 32 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 11, 15, 23, 25, and 29 have been amended. Support for the amendments is found on, but not limited to, pages 25-26 of the Specification. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response After Final Action, Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 10-16, 19-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, and 32 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 7, 13-15, 19, 25, 27-29, 31, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopal et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0032263 (hereafter Gopal) in view of Jawahan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,289,333 (hereafter Jawahan). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites (as amended):

A method for handling an exception in a business-to-business transaction comprising:
monitoring an internet gateway through which the business-to-business transaction passes for exceptions, wherein the exceptions comprise timer expiration exceptions issued when a sending application does not receive a confirmation within a predetermined

amount of time, transaction exceptions generated when content, format, security availability or other characteristics of the transaction are out of pre-determined boundaries, and network exceptions issued when a message infrastructure cannot support the message transaction, wherein if an exception is detected:
using an intelligent contact manager **to automatically locate an authorized representative from a hierarchical list of designated persons**, wherein the authorized representative is a designated person who has authority to consummate the business-to-business transaction;
using a unified communication system to automatically **notify the authorized representative of the exception**;
if said authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of said exception, repeating said using an intelligent contact manager and said using a unified communication system to locate and to notify another authorized representative from said hierarchical list until receipt of said confirmation from any notified authorized representative; and
if necessary, automatically establishing a web collaboration session between representatives of the business-to-business transaction to resolve said exception. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that the combination of Gopal and Jawahan does not teach, suggest, or motivate the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitations, "using an intelligent contact manager **to automatically locate an authorized representative from a hierarchical list of designated persons...notify the authorized representative of the exception**," (emphasis added), and "**if said authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of said exception, repeating said using an intelligent contact manager and said using a unified communication system to locate and to notify another authorized representative from said hierarchical list until receipt of said confirmation from any notified authorized representative**," (emphasis added) . In contrast, Gopal states that a network operations center

(NOC) (112) monitors the physical status of network (101) and is notified of problems (or exceptions). [Gopal; Page 2, paragraph 0021]. In response to problems (or exceptions), the NOC (112) transmits alert messages to network managers or other personnel responsible for maintaining the network system. Id. That is, the NOC (112) transmits alert messages to predefined destinations (e.g., network managers or other personnel responsible for maintaining the network system) instead of locating an authorized representative from a hierarchical list of designated persons and notifying the authorized representative of the problem (or exception), as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

Further, after the NOC (112) transmits alert messages to network managers or other personnel responsible for maintaining the network system, the NOC (112) does not expect a confirmation acknowledging notification of the problem (or exception). Thus, Gopal does not teach, suggest, or motivate that if the authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of the exception (or problem), the locating and the notifying of another authorized representative from the hierarchical list is repeated until receipt of the confirmation from any notified authorized representative, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Further, Jawahan does not teach, suggest, or motivate that if the authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of the exception (or problem), the locating and the notifying of another authorized representative from the hierarchical list is

repeated until receipt of the confirmation from any notified authorized representative, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

As described above, the combination of Gopal and Jawahan does not teach, suggest, or motivate all the limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Gopal and Jawahan and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 7 and 13-14 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over the combination of Gopal and Jawahan. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 7 and 13-14 are patentable over the combination of Gopal and Jawahan for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 15, 25, and 29, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 15, 25, and 29 recite similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claims 15, 15, and 29 are directed to inventions comprising one of the following limitations: "if said authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of said exception, said intelligent contact manager and said unified communication system continue to locate and to notify another authorized representative from said hierarchical list until receipt of said confirmation from any notified authorized representative," "if said authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of said exception, repeating said

using an intelligent contact manager and said using a unified communication system to locate and to notify another authorized representative from said hierarchical list until receipt of said confirmation from any notified authorized representative,” and “means for receiving a confirmation acknowledging notification of said exception, wherein said means for using an intelligent contact manager and said means for using a unified communication system continue to locate and to notify another authorized representative from said hierarchical list until receipt of said confirmation from any notified authorized representative”. The combination of Gopal and Jawahan does not teach, suggest, or motivate the cited claim limitations of Independent Claims 15, 25, and 29. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 15, 25, and 29 are patentable over the combination of Gopal and Jawahan and are in condition for allowance for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 19, 27-28, and 31-32 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 15, 25, and 29, which are allowable over the combination of Gopal and Jawahan. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 19, 27-28, and 31-32 are patentable over the combination of Gopal and Jawahan for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 3 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopal et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0032263 (hereafter Gopal) in view of Jawahan et al., U.S. Patent No.

6,289,333 (hereafter Jawahan) further in view of Kikinis, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2004/0049562 (hereafter Kikinis). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 3 and 16 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1 and 15, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Gopal and Jawahan. Moreover, Kikinis does not teach, suggest, or motivate that if the authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of the exception (or problem), the locating and the notifying of another authorized representative from the hierarchical list is repeated until receipt of the confirmation from any notified authorized representative, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1, and does not teach, suggest, or motivate that if the authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of the exception, the intelligent contact manager and the unified communication system continue to locate and to notify another authorized representative from the hierarchical list until receipt of the confirmation from any notified authorized representative, as in the invention of Independent Claim 15. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 1 and 15 are patentable over the combination of Gopal, Jawahan, and Kikinis for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 3 and 16 are patentable over the combination of Gopal, Jawahan, and Kikinis for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 8 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopal et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0032263 (hereafter Gopal) in view of Jawahan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,289,333 (hereafter Jawahan) further in view of Zhu, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0194272 (hereafter Zhu). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 8 and 20 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1 and 15, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Gopal and Jawahan. Moreover, Zhu does not teach, suggest, or motivate that if the authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of the exception (or problem), the locating and the notifying of another authorized representative from the hierarchical list is repeated until receipt of the confirmation from any notified authorized representative, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1, and does not teach, suggest, or motivate that if the authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of the exception, the intelligent contact manager and the unified communication system continue to locate and to notify another authorized representative from the hierarchical list until receipt of the confirmation from any notified authorized representative, as in the invention of Independent Claim 15. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 1 and 15 are patentable over the combination of Gopal, Jawahan, and Zhu for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims

8 and 20 are patentable over the combination of Gopal, Jawahan, and Zhu for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 10-12 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopal et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0032263 (hereafter Gopal) in view of Jawahan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,289,333 (hereafter Jawahan) further in view of Lettich, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0049622 (hereafter Lettich). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 10-12 and 22-24 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1 and 15, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Gopal and Jawahan. Moreover, Lettich does not teach, suggest, or motivate that if the authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of the exception (or problem), the locating and the notifying of another authorized representative from the hierarchical list is repeated until receipt of the confirmation from any notified authorized representative, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1, and does not teach, suggest, or motivate that if the authorized representative fails to send a confirmation acknowledging notification of the exception, the intelligent contact manager and the unified communication system continue to locate and to notify another authorized representative from the hierarchical list until receipt of the confirmation from any notified authorized representative, as in the invention of

Independent Claim 15. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 1 and 15 are patentable over the combination of Gopal, Jawahan, and Lettich for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 10-12 and 22-24 are patentable over the combination of Gopal, Jawahan, and Lettich for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 10-16, 19-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, and 32) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 10-16, 19-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, and 32) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.


Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: _____

3/6/06



James P. Hao
Registration No. 36,398

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060